

What techniques and deployment modes will tend to improve trust in automatically improved code and how do we surface and evaluate these “trust issues” as a research questions?

Stefan Forstenlechner

Natural Computing Research & Applications Group  
University College Dublin



# Psychology

- How did people start to trust compilers?
- What is the largest code change developers accept (from humans/machines)?
- Humans might only use what they know.

# Psychology

- Gradually introduce GI
  - Learn in the background
  - Hints/Suggestions
  - Feedback
  - Small changes
  - Slowly increase size of changes
- Can "over-trusting" become an issue?

# Double deployment

- Can you run human and AI improved code in parallel?
- Use one to check the other
- In case of success, slowly replace human code

# Build trust

- Usability
  - GI should not be a hassle
  - GI should add benefit
- Success stories
  - Convince everyone from the developer to the upper management
- Open source vs closed source

# Where is GI more trustworthy than a human?

- Response time
- Iterative process
  - Can show intermediate results
- People can be protective of their code. GI does not care.
- GI does not have human weaknesses

# Why GI is better ;)

- Humans join/leave teams
- GI can learn from mistakes
- GI can help train new developers

# Refactoring

- Developers do not like refactoring
- GI can learn or be told the rules
- GI can help guide or even apply rules



# Getting feedback from a human vs machine

- Machine might not be as trusted (at first)
- Especially for new developers feedback from machines might not be as embarrassing

# Acknowledgements

```
$ apt-get moo  
  
      (  )  
      (oo)  
     /-----\  
    /         \  
   /           \  
  /             \  
 * /             \  
   /             \  
  /             \  
 /             \  
/             \  
~             ~  
~             ~  
... "Have you mooed today?" ...
```